

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed January 2, 2009, claims 1 – 10 were rejected. In response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 7, and 10. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the below-provided remarks.

For reference, paragraphs [0005] and [0039] (as published in U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2008/0285532 A1) are amended to remove embedded hyperlinks.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 1 – 5 and 7 – 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Black (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2007/0127374 A1). Additionally, claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black in view of Balasuriya (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2005/0124365 A1). However, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable over Black and Balasuriya for the reasons provided below.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to particularly point out that “floor access is separately managed within a single Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) as defined by the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF).” Support for the amendment is found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, paragraphs [0012], [0056], [0060] and Fig. 5.

Applicant asserts that Black does not disclose a communications system in which “floor access is separately managed within a single Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) as defined by the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF)” as recited in amended claim 1. Although Black discloses that an audio floor and a video floor may be established simultaneously within the same group of communications devices, Black does not disclose that the simultaneous floor access is separately managed within a single IETF-defined SIP session. Because Black does not disclose that the simultaneous floor access is separately managed within a single IETF-defined SIP session, Applicant asserts that claim 1 is not anticipated by Black.

Independent Claims 4, 7, and 10

Independent claims 4, 7, and 10 have been amended to include similar limitations to claim 1. Although the language of claims 4, 7, and 10 differs from the language of claim 1 and the scope of claims 4, 7, and 10 should be interpreted independently of claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above in regard to claim 1 apply also to claims 4, 7, and 10.

Dependent Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 9

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1, claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 4, and claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 7. Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 9 are allowable at least based on allowable base claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amended claims and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: April 1, 2009

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111